

Date: Thu, 10 Jun 93 17:36:52 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #711  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Thu, 10 Jun 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 711

Today's Topics:

                    blind VEs  
                    Ham radio in TV shows  
                    Kenwood computer interface ??  
                    More 'June VHF ...'  
                    N connectors for RG-58? (2 msgs)  
                    QSLing practices (2 msgs)  
                    RE BLIND VES  
                    Some T9 QSL info  
                    The ITU phonetic alphabet

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 18:21:30 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!  
mikef@ames.arpa  
Subject: blind VEs  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C8Bo6L.A4F@fc.hp.com> perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

>  
>This discussion is subtle in that both sighted and blind have  
>preconceived notions about how the other side lives. This makes it hard  
>for blind and sighted to communicate. Our language is even skewed - for  
>example, I say "I see" when I mean "I understand". As a sighted  
>individual, I envision situations that could cause problems for blind  
>VEs, yet there may be a reasonable workaround.

>

Your post is reasoned and asks valid questions. It deserves a reasoned response. I shall try to write one.

Before proceeding, however, it should be noted that the blind, too, use words like "see" in the same way you, the sighted, do -- that is, as a synonym for understanding. It is interesting to contemplate the profound implications the linkage of sight with understanding in our language has for the presumed capabilities (or lack thereof) of the blind and their status (or lack thereof) in our society. But this is r.r.a.m., not soc. ... Suffice to say that we understand and still use the same words as you.

One more thing should be noted before we proceed. You say: "Prove that the blind can be VE's." Note the underlying assumption -- an assumption of incapability that the blind must overcome that other groups in society are not subjected to. Requiring the blind to "prove" that they can be VEs is, IMHO, one of those tasks that is an impossibility from a logical standpoint in that the question is so posed as to be unanswerable and subject to an infinite variety of citations of "what-if" scenarios.

IMHO it would be much fairer to say: name fifty incidents in which blind VEs were incapable of successfully administering the exams and in which unqualified persons obtained licenses. Even then, one would have to prove the blindness and not some other problem, caused the fraudulent exams to slip through. (Surely you're not going to tell me that the sighted are immune to dishonesty, mistakes or incompetence.) In other words, in the American spirit of "innocent until proven guilty", it would be much fairer to allow blind VEs to operate using whatever alternative techniques they choose until a rash of incidents from around the country indicates that there is a problem. I have heard of no such epidemic of cheating at the hands of blind VEs. To do anything else is, IMHO, casting in regulations the notions of some as to what the blind are capable of doing.

But to your discussion.

>

>Just saying the FCC ruling is "discriminatory" isn't enough - that's a  
>red herring that panders to Political Correctness. Prove that the blind  
>are capable of being VEs.

We, the blind, have cited the cases of hundreds of blind teachers, professors, merchants and, yes, some blind diplomats, who have carried out teaching and other sensitive functions which required

detection of possible fraud. Yet our citations do not seem to carry any weight. Under these circumstances, is it any wonder that some expect a note of truculence in our posts? We can be forgiven for asking what it takes to make our case. As Martin Luther King, Jr. put it: How long, O lord? But I digress.

>

>In principle I'm against limiting a group of people based on my  
>preconceived notions (aka prejudice). This prejudice is based partly on  
>incomplete understanding. So, I need some data. The concept of  
>"reader" is new to me. Could someone explain (Mike, you seem to know)  
>what a reader is (person or device), if the reader must be technically  
>competent (e.g. hold an Extra License), and how a blind VE overcomes  
>these problems:

>

A reader is just what it sounds like -- a person whom one employs to read anything one tells him/her to do. Conceivably, that might include observing the room in which an exam is taking place. Would a reader have to hold an Extra Class license? I'd say no. Do we require secretaries in physics departments to hold PH.D.'s in physics? Must secretaries to CEO's have M.B.A.'s? No. It is up to the blind person using the reader to determine the qualifications and salary of his/her readers. If he/she performs poorly thereby, fire him/her. If he/she performs competently thereby, reward him/her as one would anyone else who's done a good job.

The principle of using sighted readers has been well-established over the past half-century. It's time the FCC came into the 20th century.

Incidentally, if a reader writes things down for the blind person, technically he/she is known as an amanuensis.

>

>1) Cheating. How do we prevent it? The FCC is ultimately interested in  
> proof that blind VEs do not compromise the program.

>1a) How do the blind check calculators that are loaded with equations,  
> constants, frequencies, etc?

>

Take the calculators away (I was never allowed to use one). I realize that this is not possible as they're allowed now (more's the pity) so the answer is simple: supply the calculators yourself and require the examinees to use *only* them. If you ask how a blind person would know what calculator was being used, well, all calculators have a distinctive sound to their keyboards. In addition, a blind person could walk by the desk and feel what was in front of the examinee. This could be done unobtrusively.

>

>1b) How do the blind detect the presence of cheat sheets? These take

> many forms - disguised as exam papers, on watchbands, behind pocket  
> calculator flaps. Perhaps they take forms that the blind do not  
> understand.

>  
We've already established that we use \*only\* supplied calculators.  
We supply the paper, pencils, etc. for the calculations. This was  
what the FCC did when giving exams in my experience. If one  
suspects watchbands, have the examinees take off their watches.

A blind person who moves among his/her examinees  
can detect much. Consider also that cheaters were/are caught  
by blind teachers in schools for the blind (and elsewhere). Ask  
them how they do it. Finally, a blind person could use the  
ubiquitous reader for cheat-control.

>1c) How do the blind detect roving eyes?

>  
An appropriate seating arrangement solves that problem. And  
again, the trusty reader could be used for that purpose.

>  
>(I've detected all these forms of cheating, but I used my eyes.)

>  
And I bet there are some cheaters that don't get caught, even with  
sighted examiners. Should this imply that the sighted are  
unqualified to administer exams? We should not impose a  
different standard of conduct/proof/evidence upon the blind  
than we do upon the sighted.

>  
>1d) How does a blind VE actually grade the exam? Grading must be done  
> in silence. We wouldn't want to repeat the answers for test  
> 3A-92-1 for whomever is still taking the test. :-) Is the blind VE  
> reduced to a rubber stamp, relying on what the reader tells them?  
> Do you \_really\_ trust your reader with your license and \$8000?

>  
I trusted readers to aid me in my education twenty-five years ago  
when my college tuition was eighteen hundred dollars per annum!

In one sense, one must trust readers. However, the wise blind  
person checks his/her readers out ahead-of-time, making sure  
they're reliable. In addition, the grading sheet might be  
in Braille (the sheet with the correct answers). In this case,  
it would be better if the reader knew nothing of amateur radio  
so that he/she would be reading just numbers/choices and the  
blind person (with his/her Braille checklist) could do the grading.

Ah, you say -- what about those taking the exam who are not  
done yet? Wouldn't the reading cause a problem? No! It's  
simple: don't grade any exams until \*all\* have finished. If some  
are taking more elements than others, then each element should be  
finished by all. In short, a little ingenuity solves the problem.

BTW, if one isn't using the mind of the xaminer -- something the blind and sighted both hopefully have -- if the whole process boils down to simple proctoring -- then there's no need to have licensed amateurs give the exams. Personally, I think the FCC should never have dumped in-house examinations for amateur licenses but that's ten years behind us.

>

>1e) Though nobody wants to admit it, we have problems with VEs that take  
> bribes. With a reader, there is an additional point of corruption.

>

How do the examinees know who's going to be my reader?

We ought to presume that VE's are a bit less dense than mercury!

>

>2) A blind VE + reader is two people, yet VEs are individually  
> accredited and responsible. Splitting the legal hairs here could  
> employ several thousand lawyers. Maybe the FCC sees the quagmire and  
> wants to step over it.

>

Then they've got a problem in that use of readers has been long established as a reasonable accommodation for blind Federal employees. The Federal government pays for readers for those blind Federal employees who desire them. I'm not saying FCC should pay for my readers; that's my responsibility. I \*am\* saying that use of readers is well-understood and sanctioned in law, regulation and practice.

>

>3) Interaction between sighted and blind VEs (other VEs and examinees).  
> Would the grading process be slower? I haven't given much thought to  
> this but I do a lot of stuff with my exam team that implicitly requires  
> sight for timely results. It is not fair to delay examinees and other  
> VEs.

>

It's hard to say. It shouldn't take any more time to grade exams using alternative techniques. I certainly wouldn't ask for extra time.

On the other hand, the regs state that examinees are to be accommodated. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. If examinees must be accommodated then it's only reasonable that some measure of accommodation be accorded the examiner.

We, the blind (at least the blind that I know) aren't asking for special favors -- just a chance to do our stuff. If we don't perform, can us!

>

>4) The blind qualify for the element 1C exemption. Yet now I hear that  
> the blind really are not limited and should be VEs. Which way is it?

> I think blind hams damage their position by accepting a exemption.  
>

You're absolutely correct! I think Docket 90-356 (or whatever its designation was) was an unparalleled disaster for hams with disabilities -- most especially the blind. Every blind ham -- whether in the National Federation of the Blind or the American Council of the Blind -- opposed granting waiver of Element 1C on the basis of blindness. A resolution passed by the 1991 national convention of the National Federation of the Blind expressly condemns the waiver and asks that, for purposes of the exemption, the blind not be considered disabled or that the blind be expressly exempted from that provision such that blindness, in and of itself, would not qualify an examinee for waiver of QRQ code tests.

We, the blind, knew that that ruling would come back to haunt us; it has. Yet, at the time, no one understood us when we objected. Now you see.

>  
>Maybe we could ask the FCC for a trial period to test the concept of  
>blind VEs. If so, we should seriously attempt to cheat the system and  
>understand if there are any fatal flaws and where accomodation can be  
>made.

Better yet, don't worry about it until and unless it proves to be a problem!

>  
>  
>73!  
>  
73!

--  
Mike Freeman | Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ  
301 N.E. 107th Street | Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com  
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA | GEnie: M.FREEMAN11  
Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----  
Date: 10 Jun 93 19:12:54 GMT  
From: exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!oversteer!wdh@sun.com  
Subject: Ham radio in TV shows  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The TV show "Wings" used an early 50's Hallicrafters S20-R receiver as a transceiver. Spotted this immediately as I used a S20R with a Heath Q-multiplier for (1/2 of) my first novice rig in the early 70's.

Of course the Professor on Giligan's Island could turn their receiver into all kinds of neat stuff including a transmitter.

Let's not get over critical of the media's usage of communication gear. Entertainment is make believe. They usually use inappropriate bicycle and cars for racing applications-so their mistakes are by no means limited to radio gear.

...Dennis Henderson, N6TTW (formerly WN0ZIJ and WN6AEG(?-its been a long time))

-----

Date: 10 Jun 1993 23:51:08 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!  
lll-winken.llnl.gov!llnl.gov!pomplun@ames.arpa  
Subject: Kenwood computer interface ??  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know the data protocol between the TM221 series of Kenwood radios and the RC10 style remote controls?? A couple years ago I started trying to dope it out with little success. The manual describes the functions of the lines in the mic connector, but not in enough detail.  
thanx 73 Don K2BIO

-----

Date: 11 Jun 93 00:08:51 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: More 'June VHF ...'  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Folks,

Those participating should remember to look out to the east from time to time, since all of the U.K. 'big guns' will be active 0900z-1700z on Sunday June 13th on 50MHz.

Who knows ... maybe work some of you whilst I'm masquerading from I082JJ as GWORDI/P

73 es gl - Iain

-----

Date: 10 Jun 1993 22:25:05 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!  
mcduffie@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: N connectors for RG-58?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Check your local Amphenol dealer. He should have some crimp on N's for 58 cable.

Gary McDuffie, Sr.           //                               ---o-----\./-----o---  
Scottsbluff, Nebraska   \\ //   mcduffie@unl.edu   ---o-----/T\-----o---  
AGON@AGON.#WNE.NE.USA.NA \X/   |

-----  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 00:19:58 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!greg@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: N connectors for RG-58?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Joe B. Simpson (jbs@ee.egr.duke.edu) wrote:

:  
: And how about an N to BNC adapter, for that odd case where someone might  
: want to hook up an HT to an antenna with an N on it? Would it be best to just  
: make jumpers for this sort of thing rather than searching for adapters?  
:

I've purchased many RG-58 N connectors at Radio Shack. Seem to work OK. They are "solderless", which I don't trust much, but I haven't had any trouble yet.

As for the N-BNC adaption, that is, in fact, what I have in my car. The external antenna came with an N connector, and I use an N-BNC adapter for my HT. They are in the same rack at RS as the N connector.

Greg   KD6KGW

-----  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 21:55:02 GMT  
From: world!sharon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: QSLing practices  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:

>Another angle on QSLing. We run contests on RTTY. For some of the contests, we  
>send out QSL cards to every station worked. This is done as a "thank you" for  
>being there for the contact. If people wish to respond to these cards, that is  
>great. If they do not wish to, that's OK too. We thought it would be nice to  
>send them, that's all. I'm not going to send SASE, since it is a lot of money  
>(most of our cards leave as 19 cent postcards) and we don't "need" a reply.



>Most stations either sent back or didn't. One guy sent a card, but attached a  
>sticker berating us for not sending him return postage and that working a rare  
>one like him (some home station is Wisconsin, I think) we should send postage if  
>we really expected a reply. The tone of the message on the sticker was such that  
>I may just mail the guy a 29 cent stamp and his card back, with the phrase "No  
>Thank You" written on his card.

I understand that, but some of these people are circling the PSE QSL option on their cards, and clearly want the card.

I haven't actually complained back to the people seeking cards without SASEs (although I must admit the thought did cross my mind!). Ultimately, it is my decision if I wish to extend this courtesy or not; once I make the decision to extend it, I will try to treat it in a courteous manner.

That brings up another interesting, separate issue -- there are some stations that send out QSL cards to all their contacts, but don't really want a reply card. Some do it for your reasons, as thanks; others like to QSL 100% so they don't have to go searching through their logs and checking when cards come in; they know they've already sent the cards. Perhaps QSL cards should have a third option besides PSE and TX, something to express the sentiment that a return card would certainly be enjoyed, but isn't necessary.

>For casual conversation contacts, I only send SASE if the person is in an  
>exceedingly rare place (since they likely have high QSLing costs due to volume)  
>or if the person at the other end asks for SASE. For DX I throw everything in the  
>BURO bin unless a station indicates a manager (I always send SASE to managers) or  
>other instructions. I usually don't bother QSLing if the DX station says  
>"direct only". A few exceptions were Pitcairn Island, after a 20 minute chat with  
>a fellow there (I sent direct and an IRC, got a quick reply) and other similar  
>ones.

I sometimes QSL direct with SASE to DX stations if I've had nice chats with them, regardless if they are "rare" or not. In fact, to some stations I also include letters and postcards, if it's been a particularly nice QSO -- and I've made some really nice friends that way. I don't mean to imply that I always demand an SASE in order to give someone the "privilege" of receiving my QSL; far from it! I just feel that in an instance where you work a station quickly that has a big pileup and you're sending direct, it would be thoughtful to consider the postal expense if you want the card. I do QSL 100% through the bureau for all stations that want my Nantucket and my UC1A/KC1YR cards.

73, Sharon KC1YR

--

Sharon Machlis Gartenberg

Framingham, MA USA  
e-mail: sharon@world.std.com

-----  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 23:14:37 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!icon.rose.hp.com!  
cmoore@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: QSLing practices  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Sharon M Gartenberg (sharon@world.std.com) wrote:

: .... Perhaps  
: QSL cards should have a third option besides PSE and TX, something  
: to express the sentiment that a return card would certainly be enjoyed,  
: but isn't necessary.

To me, that's what I mean when I send a card with PSE marked and no SASE. I  
am asking for a card in response, but I'm not surprised if I don't get one.  
If it's really important to me that I get a card I send a SASE.

Personally I send a card back to anyone who asks for one, but I understand that  
for some people that's just not practical.

Chris Moore  
N6IYS  
cmoore@mothra.rose.hp.com

-----  
Date: 10 Jun 93 13:04:00 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!engr.uark.edu!  
news.ualr.edu!chaos!paul.graziani@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: RE BLIND VES  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Subject Blind VEs

Well, here's my \$0.02 worth for the blind VE controversy.

FYI, a sightee is a pejorative term used by us folks who  
are blind to tag a sighted bigot.

Q. How many sightees does it take to change a light bulb?

A. None, because sightees cannot do anything in the dark.

Er go, all you sighted folks better go find a blind friend to help you with that next burned out light bulb job because we all know none of you can work in the dark.

See, the same bigoted logic can be applied to you sightees as the FCC and the VECs use on us.

Now want to hear a real funny one. I have been an accredited VE since the inception of the program and have been assisting with exams since then. I am totally blind but never bothered to tell the VEC when I was accredited. Guess I'll lay that all aside now because the FCC and the VECs now tell me that I am incompetent to do it any more. Funny thing, no complaints from examinees in all the years I've been doing it and another funny thing. The teams I serve on have a reputation of running exams by the book and in a fair, considerate, and efficient manner. Oh well, what do I know. I'm just one of those incompetent blind people.

-----  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 22:24:23 GMT  
From: world!sharon@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Some T9 QSL info  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

QSL manager for T93M and T940N is DL80BC.

People will have to be patient -- those stations have made more than 12,000 QSOs in the past month; and, because of the war, it's impossible to send log information out by mail. That leaves either voice skeds or an overburdened packet system; and since Sarajevo generally only has electricity for a few hours a day, if at all, and the guys no doubt want to use the time they can work on the air to work on the air instead of spending all of it reading log info to their manager, it will take a lot of time for them to catch up.

They are working under unimaginably difficult conditions in the middle of some really awful fighting, and everyone's understanding is appreciated.

73,

Sharon KC1YR

--

Sharon Machlis Gartenberg  
Framingham, MA USA  
e-mail: sharon@world.std.com

-----

Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 22:09:03 GMT  
From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!calvin.tti.com!cole@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The ITU phonetic alphabet  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <130431@netnews.upenn.edu> yee@mipg.upenn.edu (Conway Yee) writes:  
>From: yee@mipg.upenn.edu (Conway Yee)  
>Subject: The ITU phonetic alphabet  
>Date: 9 Jun 93 19:17:27 GMT  
>The rational behind a phonetic alphabet is to make the copying of letters  
>easier; on the air, many of the letters can sound alike. The use of identifying  
>words makes the differentiation much easier.  
>  
>I have been told that the use of multi-syllable words also makes things easier  
>since if one syllable is missed, the rest of the word can identify the first  
>syllable. Thus, the redundancy in the English language is used to great  
>advantage.  
>  
>Now for my question. What was the rational behind using the words Mike and  
>Golf for the letters M and G? A multisyllabic word would seem to me more  
>appropriate. In other phonetic alphabets, for instance, I recall the word  
>Greyhound for G.  
>  
>  
>  
>--

>411 Blockley Hall		Conway Yee, N2JWQ
>418 Service Drive		yee@ming.mipg.upenn.edu (preferred)
>Philadelphia, PA 19104		cy5@cunixa.cc.columbia.edu (forwarded to above)
>(215) 662-6780		

I would think that preference would be given to short words, to make communications faster, even if they weren't as unmistakeable as "supercalifragilisticexpialidocious" :-)

Randy KN6W

-----

Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1993 19:30:56 +0000

From: agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!pipex!bnr.co.uk!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!  
dave@ames.arpa  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <130431@netnews.upenn.edu>, <1993Jun10.035536.12091@bongo.tele.com>,  
<jfhC8F1Ex.Gn3@netcom.com>  
Reply-To : dave@llondel.demon.co.uk  
Subject : Re: The ITU phonetic alphabet

In article <jfhC8F1Ex.Gn3@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack F. Hamilton) writes:  
>

> Hotel may not be a good choice. The h is silent in French, and my vague  
> memory of a trip to Italy many years ago tells me that the word for hotel  
> doesn't even have an h in Italian. Quebec is pronounced with a k sound in  
> French. Whisky is pronounced with a v sound in many languages.  
>

Surely the point is that 'visky' and 'whisky' sound similar enough on-air,  
and unlike anything else. 'Hotel' and 'Otel' sound similar enough as well.  
After all, things like 'B' and 'D' might be confused if pronounced as  
letters, but 'bravo' and 'delta' are definitely different.

You could always try an early British Army alphabet which had 'Emma' for  
'M' !

Dave

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 \* You think \*you\* have problems? \*  
\* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet \* What do you do if you \*are\* \*  
\* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org Amprnet \* a manically depressed robot?? \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Date: 10 Jun 1993 22:30:31 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!  
bogus.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!lynx.unm.edu!dns1.NMSU.Edu!  
weasel@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9306021339.AA02237@tix.timeplex.com>,  
<C828rG.7JJ@avalon.chinalake.navy.mil>, <1993Jun3.213629.1@kean.ucs.mun.ca>ed-1.p  
Subject : Re: Velocity of light

jcraig@kean.ucs.mun.ca wrote:  
: In article <C828rG.7JJ@avalon.chinalake.navy.mil>,  
erik@peewee.chinalake.navy.mil (Erik van Bronkhorst Code C02313  
Phone 939-1421) writes:

```

: > Seth Taylor (taylor@tix.timeplex.COM) wrote:
: > : free space), Does anyone out there know why Einstein used the term
: > : c in the famous equation,  $E = mc^2$ , where c = velocity of
: > : light (300,000 mtrs/sec) ??
: > : Seth T. KC2WE
: I think that should be km/s. If you want to be exact, c=299,792,458 m/s
: >
: > Because Einstein was at the same time declaring the velocity of
: > light to be Constant. (In fact, a "universal" constant).
: >
: My guess is you need light to "c" :-) ... (sorry)
: > --
: > Erik van Bronkhorst KC6UUT DoD#4342585443 AMA#[classified]
: > "Truth is false and logic lost, now the fourth dimension is crossed..."
: Joe, VO1NA

```

Argh - I was going to say the SAME thing....funny how you get more than one bad punner here :)

--

```

.....
: _\| /\ |/_ T.J. Harrell III :
:  \/  \/   P.O. Box 4334 :
:  /      \  Las Cruces NM 88003 :
: /_____\  weasel@acca.nmsu.edu :
:.....

```

-----

Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Paul Graziani WD5BIV

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #711  
\*\*\*\*\*